

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action mailed June 10, 2005. Review and reexamination is respectfully requested.

The Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 15-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Best (FR 2608708), and rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Best (FR 2608708) in view of Smith et al (5263694).

The Examiner also objected to claim 18 due to informalities.

The Present Amendment

Claim 1, as amended, recites spring fingers slots having parallel sides which is not disclosed in Best. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15-17 dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Best. Furthermore, claims 18-20 also recited a stackable spring washer with parallel sided slots and fingers which is not disclosed by Best. The informalities in claims 18 and 19 have also been amended. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 2-7, 18-20 and 21-23 are in condition for allowance.

The Pending Claims 9-14 are Now Patentable Over

Best in View of Smith

The examiner rejected claim 9-14 under 35 U.S.C, §103(a) as being unpatentable over Best in view of Smith. Claim 8 has been canceled. With respect to claims 9-14, there is no motivation to combine the references. In order to properly combine references under 35 U.S.C- §103 there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of these separate references. There is no motivation to combine Best with Smith. Further, even if combined, Smith and Best fail to disclose or make obvious the recited finger slots of these claims. Accordingly, claims 9-14 patentably distinguish from the Best in view of Smith are allowable.

In addition, because the Best is in a language other than English and Examiner seeks to rely on Best, "a translation must be obtained so that the record is clear as to the precise facts the examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection." *MPEP* §706.02 The full text document may include additional teachings away from the invention that will further preclude an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. *Id.* Therefore, applicants respectfully request a full text translation of Best or, in the alternative, a withdrawal of Best as a basis for rejection.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 -7 and 9-23 are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH &
McKEE, LLP

9/28/05
Date

Robert V. Vickers, Reg. No. 19,504
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582